

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Dromgold, Diane

Serial Number: 10/582,824

Filing Date: June 14, 2006

Art Unit: 3623

Examiner: Swartz, Stephen S.

For: **Project management method and system**

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

This paper is submitted in response to the Office action mailed March 17, 2011.
Reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the first Office action on the merits.

Claims 14-16, 18-20, 23-24 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Miller, U.S. Patent No. 6,101,481. With respect, this rejection is traversed.

The applicable legal standard is a strict one. To establish anticipation, *every element and limitation of the claimed invention* must be found in a single prior art reference, *arranged as in the claim*. *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.*, 242 F.3d 1376, 1383 (Fed. Cir. 2001). “Absence from the reference of *any* claimed element negates anticipation.” *Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1565, 1571 (Fed.Cir. 1986)(emphasis supplied).

Miller is directed to a project management system that is task-oriented, rather than resource/person-oriented. The system relies upon information hiding to restrict write/read/modify access to assigned personnel or task controllers. FIG. 1 and FIG. 1A of the